

of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1438/Rev.1 contained in document A/C.2/L.1484.

8. Miss GHOSE (India) requested that consideration of the draft resolution should be deferred until a later meeting, since the informal consultations on it were almost, but not quite, completed.

It was so decided.

Organization of work

9. The CHAIRMAN suggested a schedule of work for the remaining meetings of the Committee, which he believed was necessary in order to facilitate the conclusion of ongoing informal consultations and the completion of the

Committee's work by Friday, 5 December, the latter being essential for the orderly conclusion of the work of the General Assembly. He earnestly hoped that the consultations would enable the Committee to adopt most, if not all, pending proposals by consensus.

10. Mr. CZARKOWSKI (Poland) endorsed the suggested schedule and proposed that it should be circulated as a Committee document¹ to assist delegations in planning their work.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 11.05 a.m.

¹ Subsequently circulated as document A/C.2/L.1485.

1709th meeting

Tuesday, 2 December 1975, at 10.45 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Olof RYDBECK (Sweden).

A/C.2/SR.1709

AGENDA ITEM 64

Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States (*concluded*)* (A/C.2/300 and Add.1 and 2, A/C.2/L.1475/Rev.1)

1. Mr. GONZALEZ GALVEZ (Mexico), introducing on behalf of the sponsors the revised draft resolution on the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States (A/C.2/L.1475/Rev.1), said that changes had been made in operative paragraph 1, where the words "common will to strengthen, develop and regulate" had been replaced with the words "united determination to strengthen and develop", and in paragraph 5, where the word "ensure" had been replaced with the word "facilitate" in the last line, in order to reflect the comments made by certain delegations during the informal consultations. Some drafting changes had been made in paragraphs 3 and 6 of the English version. The sponsors hoped that it would now be possible to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

2. The CHAIRMAN said that a vote had been requested on the draft resolution by some members of EEC.

At the request of the representative of Mexico, the vote was taken by roll-call.

Bolivia, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Bolivia, Botswana, Bulgaria, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dahomey, Democratic Yemen, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq,

Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Mozambique, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados.

Against: Germany (Federal Republic of), United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Bahamas, Belgium.

The revised draft resolution was adopted by 85 votes to 3, with 12 abstentions.

3. Mr. MADDY (Guinea), Mr. TOURÉ (Guinea-Bissau), U SAN MAUNG (Burma), Mr. HACHANI (Tunisia), Miss GARCIA DONOSO (Ecuador), Mr. OPANGA (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. CHELLE (Uruguay), Mrs. COLMANT (Honduras), Mr. ACEMAH (Uganda) and Mr. SCHUPPUS (Togo) said that they would have voted in favour of the draft resolution if they had been present during the voting.

4. Mr. VALLE (Brazil) said that he had been absent during the voting and would have voted in favour of the draft resolution. However, he reiterated his delegation's reservations about article 3 of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

* Resumed from the 1704th meeting.

5. Mr. PETRONE (Italy) expressed regret that the draft resolution had been put to the vote and that during the consultations neither side had shown any willingness to negotiate. His delegation's abstention must be interpreted primarily as an expression of its disappointment that the implementation of what was essentially a promising procedural arrangement for the re-examination of the most controversial parts of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States had been jeopardized.
6. Mr. DONNELLY (United Kingdom) said that his delegation regretted having had to vote against the draft resolution, although it appreciated the efforts of the sponsors to arrive at a text which would have been acceptable to it. Its position concerning the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States was unchanged and it could not, therefore, be a party to the sentiments expressed in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, nor could it agree to request the Secretary-General to give the widest dissemination to a document with which, in some respects, it still fundamentally disagreed. His delegation was prepared to continue to work for a charter that could command the full support of all Members of the United Nations, and trusted that paragraph 3 of the draft resolution would be implemented in that spirit.
7. Mr. GONZALEZ (Paraguay) and Mr. VALDES (Bolivia) said that they had voted in favour of the draft resolution. Nevertheless, their delegations maintained their reservations with respect to article 3 of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.
8. Mr. STURKEY (Australia) said that his delegation had voted in favour of General Assembly resolution 3281 (XXIX). Its vote in favour of the draft resolution should be viewed in the context of the interpretative statement made by the representative of Australia at the 1650th meeting of the Committee, on 9 December 1974.
9. Mr. YORK (Federal Republic of Germany) regretted that it had not been possible to arrive at a text acceptable to all delegations.
10. His delegation had voted against the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States and had had serious reservations concerning the resolutions adopted at the sixth special session of the General Assembly. Accordingly, it had been unable to support a draft resolution which was based on those instruments but which made no allowance for its position on them. He also had grave doubts about the advisability of giving wide dissemination to a document on which serious reservations had been expressed.
11. Mr. GALLAGHER (Ireland) said that there had been little real progress towards giving effect to the provisions of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, which had been adopted at the twenty-ninth session against the wishes of a small but important number of States representing an indispensable component without which a new international economic order could have little real meaning. It was difficult to understand with whom developing countries expected to negotiate substantially if they could not agree with those very countries which had been unable to vote in favour of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, namely, the majority of the States members of EEC and the United States of America.
12. Ireland had not rejected the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, but had not been able to vote for it either. It had been disappointed to see consensus on so fundamental a document gradually slipping away as the negotiations at Mexico City, Geneva and finally New York had become increasingly intransigent. The exercise had been futile and the result was a Charter that meant little because it had failed to reconcile the interests of the developed and developing worlds in a manner advantageous to both. For a country such as Ireland, which had consistently spoken in advocacy of the development needs of the third world, the failure of the Charter to gain universal acceptance was indeed disappointing. The entire international community must accept some measure of responsibility, not least for the intransigence that had prevented the document from being universally acceptable in the first place.
13. In the course of the current session, his delegation had again noted with concern attempts to accord to the Charter a status which was hardly justified in the light of the fundamental disagreements on it. There had been frequent references to the fact that the Charter was a resolution of the General Assembly; however, it had not been accepted by the countries which mattered most if a meaningful new international economic order was to be established.
14. His delegation had been obliged to abstain from voting both at the preceding session and on the draft resolution now adopted. That did not signify any disagreement with the basic principles of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States; indeed, Ireland could have endorsed most of the text, the exceptions being articles 4 and 26, which certain Member States had unfortunately politicized to an extent unacceptable to EEC, notwithstanding the fact that those articles were quite unrelated to any interest that developing countries were trying to advance.
15. On the question of the Charter's status as a General Assembly resolution, he pointed out that progress would not be achieved by steam-rolling unacceptable documents through the Assembly on the strength of built-in majorities, and no amount of repetition would make the Charter acceptable to those countries—the most important from the point of view of the third world—which had rejected it.
16. Mr. TANABE (Japan) said that his delegation had abstained in the vote on the draft resolution because the position of his Government on General Assembly resolution 3201 (S-VI), 3202 (S-VI) and 3281 (XXIX), including in particular article 34 of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, remained unchanged.
17. Mr. BAKER (United States of America) said that he had voted against the draft resolution. He appreciated the efforts of the Mexican delegation to arrive at a text acceptable to the United States. He shared the views expressed by a number of representatives in explaining their votes, particularly the representative of Ireland.
18. His delegation had voted against the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, and the serious

reservations it had expressed with regard to that document remained unchanged.

19. Mr. WILDER (Canada) regretted that it had been necessary to take a vote on the draft resolution. His delegation had felt that the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States as a whole did not adequately reflect a consensus within the international community. It had abstained from voting on the draft resolution because the text did not reflect a desire to resolve the remaining difficulties with respect to the Charter.

20. Mr. GAJENTAAN (Netherlands) said his delegation had hoped that the draft resolution would contribute to achieving a genuine consensus on the Charter, on which the Netherlands had abstained from voting; since no consensus had been reached, it had abstained on the draft resolution also.

21. Mr. MASSONET (Belgium) said that he had abstained from voting on the draft resolution chiefly because it concerned an implementation measure and would have been complete if it had consisted only of paragraphs 3, 4 and 6.

22. Mr. PFANZELTER (Austria) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution. Its vote should be viewed in the context of the interpretative statement made by his delegation on 9 December 1974, after the Committee had adopted the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States. His delegation's attitude towards the articles to which it had referred on that occasion remained unchanged.

23. Mr. ROUGÉ (France) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the Charter and on the draft resolution just adopted, which neither added to nor subtracted from the Charter.

24. Mr. BA-ISSA (Democratic Yemen) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, in keeping with its belief that a new international economic order was needed in order to put an end to imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism and all forms of racial discrimination, to halt foreign aggression and the occupation by States of the territory of other countries and to consolidate the development of the developing countries, ensure their sovereignty over natural resources and eliminate exploitation and the activities of monopolistic corporations.

25. His delegation attached particular importance to paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, and felt that the united determination to which it referred could become a reality only if ambiguous positions were abandoned. The dialogue begun at the seventh special session of the General Assembly would not bear fruit until relations based on equality and interdependence had been established.

AGENDA ITEM 12

Report of the Economic and Social Council [chapters II, III (sections A to E, G, H and J to L), IV and VI (sections A to D and F)] (*continued*) (A/10003, A/10003/Add.1 (parts I to III))

UNITED NATIONS WATER CONFERENCE (A/C.2/L.1477, A/C.2/L.1487)

26. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.2/L.1477, concerning the United Nations Water Conference, and drew attention to the statement of administrative and financial implications contained in document A/C.2/L.1487.

27. Mr. OLIVERI LOPEZ (Argentina) said that the United Nations Water Conference was of the utmost significance to the international community, in view of the vital importance of water to human life. The grave consequences of a possible water shortage made it appropriate to conduct a world-wide survey of the extent of water resources and future needs. Such an exercise was feasible only through intensified international co-operation, and that was precisely what the United Nations Water Conference was intended to promote. The Conference would make a detailed study of current and future water resources for all purposes, from domestic to agricultural and industrial, including food production. The technological potential for the efficient use of water, and the risks of pollution resulting from increasing industrialization, also called for evaluation, exchange of information, and decisions taken with the full participation of all States and covering the full range of implications.

28. Argentina was the host country for the Conference and would share the organization work with the United Nations; an interministerial technical group had been established for that purpose and was functioning as the national co-ordinating committee for the preparation of the Conference. The Government was considering the possibility of holding, in conjunction with the Conference, an exhibition relating to the topics on the Conference's agenda, including a display of existing technologies. The intention was to impart to the exhibition an international character through the participation of all interested Member States. The Executive Secretary of the United Nations Water Conference was currently visiting Argentina in connexion with the organization and preparation of the Conference.

29. In introducing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1477 on behalf of the sponsors, which now included Bangladesh, Ecuador, Egypt, Finland, Mali, Senegal and Singapore, he called particular attention to the functions of the Committee on Natural Resources as the preparatory committee for the Conference, whose tasks included finalizing the provisional agenda and considering the reports of the regional meetings. The request to the Secretary-General, in Economic and Social Council resolution 1979 (LIX), to ensure full co-ordination with the preparatory work for the United Nations Conference on Desertification must also be kept in mind, and he drew attention to the Council's recommendation that Governments which had not done so should start the preparation of their contribution to the Conference.

30. The draft resolution requested the Secretary-General to give ample support to the Conference secretariat, a request which was particularly important in view of the small budget provided for the Conference. One consequence of the meagreness of the budget would be the lack

of qualified staff to perform the multifarious tasks which a meeting of such magnitude required. The staff of the Centre for Natural Resources, Energy and Transport would, of course, support the small executive secretariat of the Conference to the best of its ability, but the specialized agencies could make a most valuable contribution by assigning staff for temporary duty. There were already some interagency arrangements of that nature, which should be extended and strengthened.

31. The sponsors of the draft resolution had agreed, during the consultations with other delegations, to replace the word "*Requests*" in paragraph 5 with the word "*Urges*". In fact, UNEP was already providing financial support for the preparatory work of the Conference by defraying part of the cost of the regional meetings, and at its fourth session in February 1976, the UNEP Governing Council would be considering the possibility of increasing its contribution.

32. He hoped that the Second Committee, and subsequently the General Assembly, would adopt the draft resolution unanimously.

33. The CHAIRMAN announced that Honduras, Sweden and Uruguay had become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1477.

34. Mr. KÖMIVES (Hungary) said that, because of its situation on the Danube, Hungary had long since realized the importance of international co-operation in water management, had established joint technical committees with neighbouring countries and had participated in multi-lateral water resources programmes. It had played an active part in initiating and implementing the International Hydrological Decade and the water-related programmes of ECE, while UNESCO-sponsored post-graduate courses in applied hydrogeology had been held regularly at Budapest, where the Danube Commission had its headquarters. Hungary therefore welcomed the proposal for a United Nations Water Conference, which it hoped would focus on policy issues of interest to national Governments and on international co-operation. As part of its contribution to the preparatory work for the Conference, Hungary had served as host for a United Nations/UNDP interregional seminar on river basin development, an outline report on which would be submitted to the preparatory meetings for the United Nations Water Conference. The preparatory work for the Conference, referred to in draft resolution A/C.2/L.1477, seemed to be defining very well the conceptual and procedural approach to be followed, and he therefore supported the draft resolution.

35. Mr. OULD SID'AHMED (Mauritania) said that, because of the recent disastrous drought, his country was greatly interested in the United Nations Water Conference and wished to become a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.2/L.1477.

36. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that, in view of the work done by the United Nations in connexion with the use and conservation of water resources, and the experience in that field which Israel could communicate to other countries, he supported the draft resolution on the United Nations Water Conference.

37. Mr. SCHWARTZ (Spain) said that his delegation had been following with great interest the progress of the preparatory work for the Conference. Spain had much practical experience of water problems and would therefore give its full support and co-operation to ensure the success of the Conference.

38. Mr. GONZALEZ GALVEZ (Mexico) stated that Mexico would participate fully in the work of the Conference and hoped that means would be found of enabling countries to place thus far unexploited water resources at the service of their peoples.

39. Mr. SINDAYIGAYA (Burundi) said that, in view of the importance which Burundi attached to the work of the United Nations in the matter of water resources, it wished to become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

40. Mr. AL-TAJIR (United Arab Emirates) said that his country also wished to become a sponsor.

41. The CHAIRMAN said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to adopt draft resolution A/C.2/L.1477, as orally revised, without a vote.

The draft resolution, as orally revised, was adopted.

AGENDA ITEM 123

Development and international economic co-operation: implementation of the decisions adopted by the General Assembly at its seventh special session (*continued*)* (A/10211, A/10395, A/C.2/296, A/C.2/299, A/C.2/L.1468, A/C.2/L.1470, A/C.2/L.1472, A/C.2/L.1473, A/C.2/L.1476, A/C.2/L.1486)

INTEGRATION OF WOMEN IN THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS (A/10211, A/C.2/L.1473)

42. Mr. GARCIA BELAUNDE (Peru), introducing draft resolution A/C.2/L.1473, said that Panama and Yugoslavia should be added to the list of sponsors. The designation of 1975 as International Women's Year had led to a greater awareness throughout the world of the problems faced by women. There was no doubt that the problem of the advancement of women, particularly in developing countries, was directly connected with development. Discrimination against women, and underestimation and exploitation of them, was a product of social and economic structures based on outworn concepts, and in developing countries the particularly serious situation of women amounted to real social and economic neglect. The international community should be gratified by the results of the International Women's Year and the Conference held at Mexico City (19 June-2 July 1975). It was clear that the work of the Year had made it possible to initiate, at the national and international levels, a process which would lead to equality between men and women. The process had begun under the best auspices, and every effort should be made to see the Year not as an end in itself but as the beginning of new incentives and projects.

* Resumed from the 1707th meeting.

43. The aim of the draft resolution was to continue the work of the International Women's Year and maintain the impetus of the Mexico City Conference and the regional meetings and seminars held throughout the world. The draft resolution also reaffirmed the idea that the integration of women in the development process must be ensured and that it should lead to equality and freedom from exploitation and oppression. The draft resolution considered the situation of women in history and recognized their potential contribution to the process of change and to the struggle against exploitation and oppression. It also recognized the need to create machinery for ensuring equality of rights and opportunities for women. The operative part of the draft resolution contained provisions addressed to the United Nations system, urging it to maintain its interest in the question of women and development, and to Governments, requesting them to take the necessary action to ensure the participation of women on an equal footing. The major aim of the draft resolution was to ensure that the impetus of the International Women's Year was maintained in the future activities of the United Nations and to request

Governments to continue the work they had begun beyond the end of the Year.

44. A spirit of goodwill and compromise had prevailed during the negotiations on the draft resolution, and he believed that the Committee was ready to adopt it by consensus. However, there were several changes to be made to the text, and he would therefore request the Secretariat to circulate a revised version on the following day.

45. Mr. BARCELO (Mexico) welcomed the fact that the integration of women in the development process was being discussed at the current session of the General Assembly. He endorsed the statement made by the representative of Peru in introducing the draft resolution and agreed that the Mexico City Conference would have important results for women in general, provided that efforts were made to continue the work of integrating women fully into the development process.

The meeting rose at 12.10 p.m.

1710th meeting

Wednesday, 3 December 1975, at 3.15 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Olof RYDBECK (Sweden).

A/C.2/SR.1710

AGENDA ITEM 67

Technical co-operation among developing countries (*concluded*)* (A/10003, chap. VI, sect. A.II; E/5646, E/5703/Rev.1, DP/117 and Add.1-6, DP/120, A/C.2/L.1438/Rev.2, A/C.2/L.1484)

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to consider revised draft resolution A/C.2/L.1438/Rev.2, concerning technical co-operation among developing countries, and informed the Committee that the administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution were to be found in document A/C.2/L.1484.

2. Mr. FLEMING (Argentina) said that a new preambular paragraph—the fifth—had been included in the draft resolution and that in paragraph 1 a new phrase reading “including the activities and projects carried out by the organizations of the United Nations development system financed by UNDP” had been added with a view to strengthening the central role of the special unit in promoting technical co-operation among developing countries throughout the entire United Nations development system. The paragraph should be considered in conjunction with paragraph 10, since the two complemented each other. With regard to paragraph 2 it should be recalled that, starting with the eighteenth session of the Governing Council, the regional commissions had become executing agencies. It should be noted that the review mentioned in that same paragraph should be carried out in the light of

the contents of the final report of the Working Group,¹ namely, the general frame of reference, the preamble, the findings, the principles and objectives and the attachment to the letter of transmittal from the Chairman of the Group to the Administrator. With regard to the recommendations, the paragraph in question indicated that the review would centre on those recommendations about which the developed countries had expressed reservations at the eighteenth session.

3. Paragraph 3 had been slightly altered so as to state more clearly the objectives in view. It should be noted that the provision of fellowships had been added to the areas of technical co-operation mentioned earlier. The suggestions and recommendations to be submitted under that paragraph would be of great interest.

4. Turning to paragraph 7, he called attention to what he said at the 1704th meeting and added that the informal consultations had resulted in the wording now under consideration, which took account of the fact that some developed countries had expressed the wish to participate in the intergovernmental regional meetings prior to the global symposium. The word “conference” had been used to make it clear that the meeting should be at the government level and not at the expert level.

5. The remaining paragraphs of the draft resolution had undergone minor drafting changes.

* Resumed from the 1708th meeting.

¹ DP/69.